

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region

April 26, 2002

ITEM: 27

SUBJECT: Executive Officer's Report

DISCUSSION:

1. **Meeting with Dairy Industry Representatives Concerning Engineered Waste Management Plans (EWMPs)** – On April 12th staff met with representatives of Western United Dairymen and Milk Producers Council concerning a backlog of dairy EWMPs that are required to be submitted to the Board. EWMPs are required by the general permit for dairies and other confined animal feeding operations, and by the cease and desist order adopted by the Board in support of the general permit.

The cease and desist order adopted in support of the general permit included a schedule by which EWMP submittals were to occur. The dairies in the region were divided into four groups, mainly by water quality priority, with each group scheduled to meet certain milestones, such as naming an engineer and submitting a draft EWMP, by a date certain. The dates for submittal of the plans were established at one year intervals, on June 1st of each year for three years (Groups A & B were both due in December 2001). Reviewing EWMPs for approximately 300 facilities is an enormous undertaking, given all of the other dairy regulatory activities that must continue, such as site inspections and complaint investigations. However, in large part due to resources provided during the current Administration, we now have a Dairy Section with seven staff members, we have had the opportunity to train staff to review, analyze and comment on the EWMPs, and we have essentially eliminated any backlog of EWMPs awaiting review and comments.

However, this has resulted in a problem for the engineering community working on the EWMPs. Another group of plans (Group C, the third of four groups) is due on June 1, 2002. We understand that a number of engineers are preparing EWMPs for submittal by the due date. The problem is that they are also working on revised plans from Groups A and B, in response to earlier comments provided by staff. This is creating a tremendous backlog for some of the smaller engineering companies.

The purpose of our April 12th meeting with the dairy industry representatives was to solicit the assistance of the industry with moving the preparation and revision of these plans away from the backlogged engineers, to other engineers who have the engineering capacity to more closely meet the Board's deadlines.

One of the engineers working on a large block of plans has particular problems with his backlog because he has accepted too many plans for preparation, has too little or no help, and has a full-time job elsewhere, not associated with the EWMPs. Another large block of plans resides with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). NRCS is a federal agency that will do the EWMPs for the dairies at no cost. However, the EWMPs are often a very low priority because NRCS has a number of other responsibilities and a very small staff.

Many of the EWMPs for Western United Dairymen members have been prepared by Nolte Engineers, and we do not have a backlog with this group of EWMPs. Milk Producers Council has recently entered into an association with Psomas Engineers, and principals with Psomas have assured staff that company resources will be dedicated to EWMPs as necessary to meet the deadlines. It is clear that there are alternatives for dairy operators who have their EWMPs stalled elsewhere.

To their credit, we understand that NRCS has determined that they will not be accepting any additional facilities for preparation of EWMPs, at least until their current backlog is eliminated. Further, both John Borges with Western United Dairymen and Nathan DeBoom of Milk Producers Council have agreed to provide assistance by notifying their members, and also by contacting dairy operators who are not their members, making them aware of the importance of preparing and implementing EWMPs for their facilities.

The enforcement consequences for those who don't move expeditiously were also discussed. There are many dairy operators who have acted responsibly and required their engineers to meet the Board's deadlines. However, there are others who have backlogged plans with either NRCS or with some of the smaller, heavily-backlogged engineers who are not acting in the same responsible manner. The operators who have contracted with the higher-cost engineers and who stand ready to implement their EWMPs are at an economic disadvantage, compared to those who have their plans backlogged at NRCS, or other places, with little likelihood of submitting their overdue plans in the foreseeable future. This is an issue of fairness and equity that must be addressed in the near future.

Staff committed to prepare a spreadsheet for the dairy organizations that identifies the EWMP compliance status for all dairies in the region. The organizations have agreed to discuss this matter internally and determine how best to contact each of the facilities with current or near-term compliance issues.

We are bringing this matter to your attention because there are a number of facilities that are in significant non-compliance due to their failure to finalize their EWMPs within 3 months (90 days) of receipt of Board staff comments. However, because of the backlog at the smaller engineering companies and engineering individuals, it is difficult to hold the dairy facilities fully culpable at this time. It is probably appropriate to first give these facilities an opportunity to move their draft plans from the engineers who have little chance of completing the plans in conformance with any reasonable schedule. There are options for these dairies, although the costs for the engineering work may go from essentially zero cost (at NRCS) to something that ranges from \$5,000 to perhaps \$10,000. Those facilities that were early in line with NRCS will have gotten a great deal on their EWMPs (no cost). Others have paid \$5,000 to \$10,000 to have other competent engineers complete their EWMPs. Many of the other dairies, particularly those with backlogged plans, fall somewhere in between. With the assistance of the industry representatives, we will work with the facilities that have seriously backlogged plans, and we will see that the plans are moved where they can be reasonably addressed, or we will initiate enforcement action to compel action by recalcitrant facilities. This will level the playing field for the dairies that must complete EWMPs (and then implement them, i.e., construction of waste containment measures). For those dairies with EWMPs residing with backlogged engineers, changing engineers or enforcement action by the Regional Board will address the economic disadvantage suffered by facilities that have acted responsibly in complying with the Board's orders.

2. **Vila Borba Project, City of Chino Hills** – The State Water Resources Control Board conducted a workshop on April 10, 2002 to discuss and receive comment on a proposed order concerning the Regional Board's June 1, 2001 action to grant Clean Water Act Section 401 certification for the Vila Borba project (the certification was contingent on the submittal of additional information). The proposed order finds that CEQA requirements had not been satisfied and directs the Regional Board to consider waste discharge requirements for the project. Joanne Schneider participated at the workshop on behalf of the Regional Board. Heather Hoecherl, an attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), represented the Petitioners, including NRDC, Defend the Bay, Paulette Hawkins and other local residents. Ms. Parente, the project applicant, was represented by Steven Elie of Musick, Peeler and Garrett.

The proposed order was presented by Michael Levy, Staff Counsel for the State Board, who did a very able job of distilling the complicated facts in this matter. Philip Wyels, Senior Staff Counsel for the State Board, graciously gave of his time to represent the Regional Board in Jorge Leon's absence.

What appeared to be a relatively straightforward matter instead turned into a lengthy discussion, occasioned by Mr. Elie's comments. Mr. Elie reiterated written comments presented to the State Board by letter dated April 5, 2002. (It is interesting to note that these comments were transmitted to us and NRDC by letter dated April 8, 2002. We received them late April 9, 2002, clearly too late to allow for any rebuttal.) In short, Mr. Elie argued that the order was unnecessary since the Petition should be viewed as moot (given the Corps of Engineers issuance of the 404 permit for the project), since Ms. Parente is not a discharger, and because there is no fully approved project pending. He also suggested that the proposed order contained inaccurate language and innuendo. The written comments state that there is at least an appearance that actions by Regional Board staff are retaliatory, an attempt to punish Ms. Parente for her discussions with the Corps of Engineers that resulted in the issuance of the 404 permit. The written comments also state that any such retaliation would be a violation of Ms. Parente's First Amendment right to free speech. Mr. Elie also made assertions about Regional Board staff's (Joanne Schneider) presentations to the Board at the June 1, 2001 hearing that were inaccurate and misleading. Joanne had the opportunity to point these errors out to the State Board and to advise that misrepresentation, omission and failed promises had characterized the Regional Board's interaction with the applicant.

At the close of the discussion, it was evident that the State Board was supportive of the proposed order, but consideration of adoption was postponed to the May hearing to allow Mr. Elie to recommend changes to the language of the order that would address his concerns. It appeared that the State Board was willing to entertain changes that would not modify the substance of the order. Mr. Elie committed to assure that Regional Board staff and the Petitioners would receive any such proposed changes in a timely manner so that all parties could attempt to reach consensus on the order by the May State Board hearing.

3. **Emergency Funding to Address Huntington State Beach Microbial Problems** – The Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA) routinely monitors beach water quality along the Orange County coast. Recent monitoring data for Huntington State Beach indicated that sewage might be leaking into a small stretch of the beach. On April 9, 2002, OCHCA closed a 2,000 foot section of Huntington State Beach to water contact recreation.

On the same day, Regional Board staff met with the OCHCA and the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) to determine the source of this suspected sewage leak. A preliminary review of the high bacterial levels and the number of people using the nearby public restrooms indicated that there was some correlation between the bacterial levels and the number of visitors using the restrooms; the higher the number of visitors using the restrooms along Huntington State Beach, the higher the bacterial levels were in the nearby ocean

waters. The preliminary conclusion from this finding was that the three restrooms in Huntington State Beach were potential sources of the sewage leak. During the summer of 1999, a similar problem north of the current location was traced to a leak from a restroom there. State Parks immediately hired a contractor to hydro test all the restrooms and the associated fixtures, including the lateral sewer lines. However, State Parks did not have a funding mechanism to pay for any emergency repairs that may be necessary. At State Parks' request, Regional Board staff immediately contacted the State Board's Cleanup and Abatement Account fund manager and obtained authorization for emergency funding for this restroom/sewer line repair project. The testing of the restrooms is ongoing, but to date has not identified any problems. The lateral lines are now being tested, and Board staff is closely monitoring the developments to determine if the emergency funds will be needed.

4. **Public Review of Proposed Newport Bay/San Diego Creek Watershed Toxics TMDLs** – On April 12, 2002, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) began the public comment period on their proposed toxics total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for the San Diego Creek watershed and Newport Bay. The USEPA and the Santa Ana Regional Board jointly committed to the development of toxics TMDLs for the watershed; USEPA is expected to establish technical TMDLs by June 15, 2002. Because the TMDLs development phase has generated considerable public interest, local media and interested stakeholders were notified of a public meeting held on April 16, 2002, at the City of Newport Beach's City Hall at which USEPA and Board staff discussed the proposed technical TMDLs.

Once the technical TMDLs are promulgated, the next steps are Regional Board development of implementation plans and consideration of Basin Plan amendments to incorporate the TMDLs in the Plan. During the next three years, the Board should anticipate the development and presentation of a number of Basin Plan amendments resulting from the technical TMDLs. The initial focus will be on chlorpyrifos, diazinon and selenium. At the same time, Board staff is overseeing/participating in a number of studies that will provide additional data critical to the development of implementation plans for the other toxic substances, and, perhaps, refinement of the TMDLs themselves. These other studies were also part of the discussion at the April 16, 2002 public meeting.

5. **Inland Empire Composting, Colton** – Inland Empire Composting (IEC), owned and operated by Jim Sullivan, is a greenwaste composting facility located near the Santa Ana River in the City of Colton. A waiver from waste discharge requirements was issued in July 1997 in accordance with Resolution No. 96-42 (Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Certain Composting Operations within the Santa Ana Region), which was updated by Resolution No. 98-30.

Under the terms of that waiver, EIC was authorized to accept and compost only greenwaste materials; acceptance of any other materials on site was prohibited without prior Board staff approval.

Beginning as early as April 1997, Board staff began to note violations at this facility. These violations consist of such activities as acceptance of food processing waste, construction of surface impoundments, an unpermitted aboveground tank, storage and dismantling of non-operational vehicles, discharge of waste oil and other spent vehicular fluids, use of unauthorized composting additives, and acceptance of non-greenwaste materials for composting.

In February 2002, Board staff discovered that EIC had stockpiled paper waste over about 16 acres of the site. This waste, which contains approximately 20 percent plastic, is derived from the processing of recycled cardboard into new boxes. The waste pile averages 3 feet in depth. It has a very high soluble salt and TDS content, and contains between about 50 and 70 percent water as it arrived at the site. Chloride, sodium, sulfate, nitrate, ammonia, and total hardness all exceed Basin Plan objectives. Petroleum hydrocarbons were also detected, but may be due to waxes and paraffin in the recycled paper waste. The facility is sited on very permeable soil, with ground water at 22 feet below ground surface during the dry season.

Board staff believes that the extensive history of violations at this facility necessitate revocation of EIC's waiver from waste discharge requirements. The City of Riverside has already canceled EIC's lease to operate on city land. Nevertheless, Mr. Sullivan intends to go forward with plans to open a large biosolids and greenwaste composting site on the north side of the Santa Ana River in the City of Colton. Board staff recently received and is reviewing the Report of Waste Discharge for this proposed facility, but has not yet begun to prepare draft WDRs for the new facility.

6. **NRDC Issues Notices of Intent to Sue to Five Dairies** – The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) and Defend the Bay have served Notices of Intent to Sue to five dairies in the Chino Basin area. In conformance with the federal Clean Water Act, the Notices of Intent were sent 60 days in advance of the intended date for filing the suits. In all cases, the notices allege that violations of multiple federal laws have occurred during the past five years, including violations of the Regional Board's NPDES permits, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liabilities Act (CERCLA). The Regional Board is not a party to the proposed lawsuits.

NRDC's letters, in part, allege violations of the NPDES permit through instances of dairy wastewater discharges to surface waters, illegal use and storage of manure, creation of a pollution or nuisance, and failure to submit all information required by the monitoring and reporting program. NRDC alleges that each dairy has been operating as an open dump in violation of RCRA and that each dairy has violated the imminent and substantial endangerment provisions of RCRA by handling dairy waste in a manner that may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment. Other allegations include violation of CERCLA by failing to report releases of hazardous levels of ammonia into the ambient air.

- 7. Update of the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waterbodies**
- On April 2, 2002, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) released the state's draft Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. As a reminder, section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act requires states to update the list of surface waterbodies for which water quality standards (beneficial uses and water quality objectives) are not attained, or are not expected to be attained with the implementation of technology-based controls. The resulting 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies includes a description of the pollutants causing impairment and a schedule for developing a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for each waterbody/pollutant.

As previously discussed with you, Regional Board staff prepared an update of the list for the Santa Ana Region and forwarded it to the State Board. This regional list included both the addition of waterbodies to the 303(d) list and deletions of waterbodies from the 303(d) list. Based on the recommendations from the Regional Boards, State Board staff drafted the proposed statewide list. State Board staff agreed with our recommendations for delisting and agreed with some of our recommendations for adding waterbodies. However, State Board staff did not agree with our recommendation that several coastal creeks (Los Trancos Creek, Muddy Creek and Buck Gully Creek) should be added to the 303(d) list for impairment of the recreation beneficial uses due to bacterial contamination. State Board staff indicated initially that these waterbodies should be excluded from the 303(d) list since these waterbodies are not identified in the Basin Plan and water quality standards have not yet been established for them.

There are a couple of issues with regard to this decision on these three coastal creeks. First, there is an issue of consistency. There are other waterbodies that Regional Board staff recommended to be added to the 303(d) list that are also not included in the Basin Plan, yet State Board staff is not proposing to exclude them from the 303(d) list. Second, State Board legal counsel has recently indicated that if a beneficial use is in fact an existing use, whether or not the waterbody is in the Basin Plan, and whether or not the beneficial use is designated in the Plan, that use must be protected. In that case, including the waterbody on the 303(d) list would be appropriate if there is evidence that the

beneficial use is impaired. Existing recreational use of Los Trancos Creek and Buck Gully Creek, at least in the lower parts of these Creeks, has been observed by Regional Board staff and the Orange County Coastkeeper, who has submitted photographic documentation (for Buck Gully) to the State Board. We currently do not have such documentation for Muddy Creek because it has more of an intermittent flow pattern.

In response to the State Board staff's proposed changes to our recommended 303(d) list and the advice more recently provided by State Board legal counsel, we are in the process of drafting a memo to State Board staff requesting a reevaluation of the justification for not including Los Trancos Creek and Buck Gully Creek on the 303(d) list of impaired waters. Regional Board staff is considering an option of listing only the lower portions of these creeks downstream of Pacific Coast Highway where documented and observed recreation occurs. In addition, since The Irvine Company has committed to diverting dry weather flows in Muddy Creek and Los Trancos Creek, it may be appropriate to further refine our recommended listing for these two creeks as impaired only during the wet season (when no diversion will occur). We are in the process of evaluating the data to determine if bacterial standards are exceeded during the wet season. We intend to work with State Board staff in the next month to address all of these issues as well as other corrections that should be made to the proposed 303(d) list (*i.e.*, it is our recommendation that the Santa Ana Delhi Channel should not be listed as impaired for the Municipal Water Supply beneficial use).

Finally, the State Board is conducting a public workshop to solicit comments on the proposed 303(d) list on May 30, 2002 in Ontario. State Board staff, with the assistance of Regional Board staff, will prepare responses to any comments received and conduct the public workshop and hearing for adoption of the statewide 303(d) list in September.

8. **Proposition 13 (Prop. 13) Grant Process Update** – In December 2001, the SWRCB announced the availability of \$82 million in Prop. 13 water quality/watershed grants, and solicited concept proposals for grant projects. Monies were allocated into five different funding programs administered by the SWRCB (or jointly between CALFED and the SWRCB). Concept proposals could be submitted to one or more programs. The funding programs and monies allocated to each are listed below:

- Coastal Nonpoint Source (CNPS) - \$30 million (\$11.8 million designated for projects within San Diego, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties);

- Nonpoint Source (NPS) - \$32 million (\$22 million designated for projects within San Diego, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties);
- Watershed Protection Program (WPP) - \$10 million (all designated for San Diego, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties) ;
- CALFED-Watershed Program - \$10 million;
- CALFED-Drinking Water Quality – \$10 million (funding generally within the area of the Central Valley / Delta System)

The deadline for submittal of concept proposals to the SWRCB was February 1, 2002. State Board staff reviewed concept proposals for completeness and format, and forwarded eligible proposals to each of the regional boards, CALFED, and Coastal Commission on or about March 1st. Out of about 560 eligible concept proposals received statewide, 67 were submitted for the Santa Ana Region.

The concept proposals generally consisted of a two-page concept proposal form, a two-page project summary, and a one-page map. Regional Board staff reviewed each of the 67 concepts relative to the requirements and limitations of the Prop. 13 program, implementation priorities for the Region, technical/scientific merit, geographic relevance, and cost effectiveness. Concept proposals went through several screening processes, including a joint evaluation between Regional Board and California Coastal Commission staff for the Coastal Nonpoint Source program. Staff completed evaluation sheets for each concept proposal, ranking them high, medium, or low, for each of the following criteria: Technical Merit; Coastal Water Quality/Nonpoint Source Priority; Likelihood of Success; and Stakeholder Support and/or Education and Outreach. Many excellent concept proposals were received. However, because of limited resources available, only the most highly ranked concepts and/or the concepts addressing the highest regional priorities were selected to go forward to the next phase of the grant selection process: submittal of a full proposal, including a detailed scope of work and project budget. On or about April 5, 2002, letters were mailed to each applicant, either inviting them to submit a full proposal or informing them that they were not selected to go forward. Staff review sheets were included with letters to applicants who received a negative response.

For the Coastal Nonpoint Source program, 16 proposals were selected to go forward, with a modified total dollar value of over \$9 million (Attachment 1). For the Nonpoint Source program, 13 proposals were selected to go forward, totaling about \$18 million (Attachment 2). For the Watershed Protection program, applicants for all six eligible concepts were invited to submit full proposals and these totaled about \$3.5 million (Attachment 3). Thirty-two proposals were eliminated from the grant selection process, and these totaled over \$65 million.

A breakdown and evaluation of each proposal not going forward are provided in Attachment 4.

Attachment 1
Full Proposals to be Requested for the Coastal Nonpoint Source Program

Proposal ID	Program Applied To	Applicant	Prop 13 \$ Req.	\$ Modified	Staff Assigned
017	SWRCB-CNPS	County of Orange Health Care Agency	750,000	200,000	WKS
045	SWRCB-CNPS	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project	404,895	404,895	DS
076	SWRCB-CNPS	Orange County CoastKeeper	649,200	649,200	PNV
088	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	City of Huntington Beach	3,292,800	800,000	SMG
089	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	City of Huntington Beach	91,000	91,000	SMG
223	SWRCB-CNPS	South Coast Resource Conservation & Develop. Council	267,125	267,125	MGA
328	SWRCB-CNPS	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project	300,000	300,000	TSR
340	SWRCB-CNPS	Newport Harbor Nautical Museum	1,500,000	1,500,000	TIS
406	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	Orange County Water District	230,000	230,000	WKS
407	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	Orange County Water District	300,000	300,000	WKS
492	SWRCB-CNPS	City of Seal Beach	920,000	920,000	SMG/KLR
493	SWRCB-WPP, CNPS	City of Seal Beach	1,100,000	1,100,000	KLR
497	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	County of Orange - PFRD	4,024,000	1,200,000	SMG
550	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	County of Orange - PFRD	844,000	844,000	WKS/DGW
580	SWRCB-CNPS	California State University	221,000	221,000	TSR
646	SWRCB-CNPS	Project - GreenWorks	320,000	320,000	SMG
		TOTAL \$\$	15,214,020	9,347,220	

#017 Request applicant to scale back and reduce cost to a maximum of \$200,000

#076 Section 319(h) funding match

#088 Request applicant to scale back and reduce cost to a maximum of \$800,000

#089 Request applicant to cooperate with Project Greenworks (#646)

#646 Request applicant to cooperate with City of Huntington Beach (*089) (only one full proposal to be submitted)

#497 Request applicant to scale back and reduce cost to a maximum of \$1,200,000

#406&407 Request that projects be combined into one proposal

Attachment 2**Full Proposals to be Requested for the Nonpoint Source Program**

Proposal ID	Program Applied To	Applicant	Prop 13 \$ Requested	Staff Assigned
035	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	City of Yucaipa	1,000,000	DGW
054	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS; CALFED-DWP	Irvine Ranch Water District	5,000,000	DS
095	SWRCB-NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	1,500,000	TIS
190	SWRCB-NPS	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA)	204,850	WBR
228	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	1,101,000	KDS
320	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS; CALFED-DWP	Municipal Water District of Orange County	567,000	KLR
362	SWRCB-NPS	San Bernardino County Flood Control District	5,000,000	MGA
404	SWRCB-WPP, NPS	Orange County Water District	450,000	KDS
405	SWRCB-NPS	Orange County Water District	1,200,000	RRN
436	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	City of Santa Ana	300,000	KLR
437	SWRCB-NPS, CNPS	City of Santa Ana	75,000	KLR
459	SWRCB-NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	900,000	WBR
612	SWRCB-NPS	Santa Ana Watershed Project Auth (SAWPA)	680,000	HAS
		TOTAL	17,977,850	

Attachment 3**Full Proposals to be Requested for the Watershed Protection Program**

Proposal ID	Program Applied To	Applicant	Prop 13 \$ Requested	Staff Assigned
546	SWRCB-WPP, NPS; CALFED-WP	City of Big Bear Lake	450,000	HMB
548	SWRCB-WPP, NPS; CALFED-WP	Big Bear Municipal Water District (BBMWD)	1,500,000	HMB
547	SWRCB-WPP, NPS; CALFED-WP	Big Bear Municipal Water District (BBMWD)	80,000	HMB
342	SWRCB-NPS, WPP	Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians	914,096	XL
296	SWRCB-WPP, NPS	San Jacinto Basin Resource Conservation District	110,000	TIS
217	SWRCB-WPP	East Valley Resource Conservation District	484,500	TIS
		TOTAL	3,538,596	

#548 - Cost range was stated as \$300,000 to \$1,500,000

#342 - Did not supply adequate information for WPP, and advise applicant accordingly

Attachment 4
Evaluation of Unsuccessful Prop 13 Proposals

Proposal #	Funding Program	Applicant	Amount Requested
029	NPS, CNPS	Trees for Seal Beach	\$1,644,000
<i>Ocean Avenue Stewardship Project</i> Unclear measure of success, and technical merit is uncertain. Addresses lower priority water quality issue compared to other proposals received. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
036	CNPS	City of Seal Beach	\$4,555,000
<i>Sewer Main Repair & Rehabilitation in the Coastal Plain</i> Good rating with respect to ranking criteria, but the proposal contained inadequate monitoring to measure degree of success; the project appeared to be ongoing; and matching funds were not documented. Overall rating: MEDIUM-HIGH			
096	NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agy	\$4,000,000
<i>Advanced Technology Manure Anaerobic Digester</i> Good overall project, but proposal did not provide enough detail. Project addresses only a small amount of total manure produced (2%), and has a high cost vs. benefit. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
097	NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agy	\$3,000,000
<i>Chino Basin Dairy Sewering Project</i> Good overall project, but proposal did not provide sufficient detail. Extent and cost of discharger use not evaluated, and everyday use may be cost prohibitive. High cost vs. benefit. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
101	NPS	City of Irvine	\$460,810
<i>Peters Canyon Wash Channel Improvements</i> Water quality improvements and protection of beneficial uses of the channel would be questionable upon implementation of the proposed project. Could create stakeholder objections due to loss of streambank habitat. Contained no education/outreach component. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
106	NPS, CALFED-DWP	MWD So. California	\$5,000,000
<i>Lake Perris Pollution Prevention & Source Water Protection Program</i> Project is not ready to go forward. Feasibility study has not been conducted (including CEQA). Impact to water quality in the Santa Ana watershed would be low. Overall rating: MEDIUM *This project is going forward under CALFED			
124	WPP	City of Colton	\$5,000,000
<i>Protection of Endangered Species and Improvements to the Amount of Water Discharged to the Santa Ana River – Completion of Storm Drain Facility</i> Not eligible for WPP, but considered under other funding programs. Proposal had no specified measure of success. It addressed “symptom” rather than “cause.” This is not a high-priority water quality improvement project, and had questionable benefit for endangered species, as well as low stakeholder support. Overall rating: MEDIUM			

125	WPP	City of Colton	\$1,749,116
<i>Elimination of septic and leach systems at the Reche Canyon Mobile Estates per Order No. 77-148</i>			
While the project would reduce groundwater impacts to a water supply well, expansion of the city's secondary treatment plant and financing a sewer system for the mobile home park are not high priority water quality issues under Prop. 13. The proposal had limited stakeholder support and/or education/outreach. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
126	CNPS	Univ. of California-Irvine	\$344,250
<i>Watershed Protection Project</i>			
The proposed project had no immediate water quality benefits and did not clearly tie in to Regional Board priorities. Overall rating: MEDIUM-LOW			
133	NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agy	\$2,275,000
<i>Inland Empire Salt Exportation Project</i>			
The proposed project ranked high in the screening process, but it is not clear whether or not regular use by dairies would be cost effective, and thus to what extent the project would succeed. Overall rating: HIGH-MEDIUM			
134	NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agy	\$3,000,000
<i>Advanced Technology Manure Pyrolysis Process</i>			
The proposal was not adequately detailed. Use of new technology limits the assurance of workability and success. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
206	NPS	City of Costa Mesa	\$398,000
<i>Santa Ana-Delhi Urban Runoff Diversion</i>			
Proposal did not include adequate measure of success, and addresses "symptom" rather than "cause." Overall rating: HIGH-MEDIUM			
227	NPS	Inland Empire Utilities Agy	\$1,450,000
<i>IEUA New Headquarters Storm Water Demonstration Site</i>			
The proposal did not include effective measure of success and provided insufficient detail. Project may be focused more on water supply rather than water quality. Overall rating: LOW-MEDIUM			
238	NPS	City of Riverside	\$960,000
<i>Sycamore Canyon Storm Water Runoff Treatment Basins</i>			
Project addresses symptoms of urban runoff NPS pollution, rather than source areas. No success measures proposed. No stakeholder or public education component. Project may adversely affect existing aquatic habitat. Overall rating: LOW			
265	NPS, CNPS	County of Orange-PFRD	\$479,200
<i>Erosion and Sediment Control Enhancement Program for the Newport Bay Watershed</i>			
Portions of the project may be implemented under existing, more cost effective, State Board programs. Proposed measures of success may be difficult to distinguish from other sediment control efforts in the watershed. Overall rating: MEDIUM			

266	NPS, CNPS	County of Orange-PFRD	\$416,000
<i>Identification of Mitigation Measures for Nitrogen and Selenium Impacts Related to GW Seepage</i>			
The proposal lacked sufficient detail to adequately evaluate technical merit. Time frame for project completion was lacking. The proposal did not describe how the project would effectively contribute to reduction of targeted pollutants. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
294	NPS	San Jacinto Basin RCD	\$102,825
<i>Practical Dairy Nutrient Management and Education Program</i>			
Some details of the proposal (e.g. measure of success) are vague. Success depends on number of dairy producers that will cooperate. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
396	NPS, CNPS	City of Huntington Beach	\$331,500
<i>Parks, Trees & Landscape Yard Storm Water Management</i>			
While construction of storage buildings is an effective BMP for reducing polluted runoff, other source reductions should be explored. Longevity of BMPs was not addressed. Stakeholder support and/or education and outreach was lacking. Overall rating: LOW			
424	CALFED-DWP	Cucamonga Cty Water Dist	\$12,250,000
<i>Installation of Infrastructure to Reduce Usage of State Project Water</i>			
This project was determined to be ineligible, by SWRCB staff. The concept proposal was not responsive to the solicitation.			
490	WPP, NPS, CNPS	City of Seal Beach	\$360,000
<i>San Gabriel River Trash Debris Boom</i>			
Ineligible under WPP. The proposed project offers an end-of-pipe solution and does not address the source. Monitoring for project success was not adequate. Stakeholder support/outreach could be improved. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
491	WPP, NPS, CNPS	City of Seal Beach	\$400,000
<i>Low Flow Storm Water Diversion West End Pump Station</i>			
Ineligible under WPP. Measurement of success was lacking. Project addresses "symptom" rather than "cause." Overall rating: MEDIUM			
500	NPS, CNPS	County of Orange – PFRD	\$434,000
<i>Wetland Restoration and Enhancement - Los Alamitos Pump Station</i>			
Project did not include an adequate measure of success, and did not address the problem at the "source." Breakdown of costs was not included, nor was a discussion of who would actually perform the proposed work. Stakeholder support and education/outreach were lacking. Overall rating: LOW			
503	NPS, CNPS	Sustainable Conservation	\$782,000
<i>Reducing the Impacts of Polluted Runoff from Auto Dismantling Facilities</i>			
Proposed project did not necessarily entail implementing the most desirable BMP for managing polluted runoff. Measurement of success may be inadequate. Water quality benefits were not convincing. Overall rating: MEDIUM			

539	NPS	City of Tustin	\$393,500
<i>Residential Septic System</i>			
Fundable projects must address an already demonstrated problem. A large portion of the proposed project seeks to establish whether or not septic systems need repair. No stakeholder support or education/outreach was identified. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
582	NPS	City of San Bernardino	\$2,500,000
<i>Vision Creek Project - Diversion and control of urban (freeway) runoff</i>			
Water quality benefits would be limited with the proposed project design. Did not address a high priority issue for the region. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
591	CNPS	Calif. State Coastal Conserv.	\$5,000,000
<i>Crystal Cove CNPS Demonstration Project: Wastewater and Urban Runoff Management and Creek Restoration</i>			
Proposal did not adequately link all aspects of the project to improvements in water quality. Restoration of septic systems may not adequately protect against bacterial contamination of coastal waters. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
608	NPS	Lake Elsin. & San Jac. Water Authority	\$1,680,000
<i>Canyon Lake Dredging</i>			
The proposed project does not address a "source" of water quality problems. Benefit to water quality is questionable. Overall rating: LOW			
633	NPS	City of Moreno Valley	\$3,200,000
<i>Heacock Channel Streambank Stabilization and Flood Protection Project</i>			
Proposal uses proven technology, but does not address a "cause," and does not address a high priority issue. Benefits to down-stream water quality are questionable. Overall rating: MEDIUM			
634	NPS	Blue Planet Foundation	\$62,000
<i>Orange County Water Education Partnership</i>			
Proposed project did not contain a measure of water quality improvements resulting from educational outreach. Technical expertise of applicant was not supplied. Overall rating: MEDIUM-HIGH			
637	CNPS	Algalita Marine Research Fdn	\$406,500
<i>Assessing and Reducing Sources of Plastic and Trash in Urban and Coastal Waters</i>			
Project area was predominantly located within Region 4. Overall rating: HIGH, but better suited for Region 4, which also considered this project.			
639	WPP, NPS, CALFED-WP	Chino Basin Watermaster	\$1,560,000
<i>Chino Basin On-Site Storm Water Management and Groundwater Recharge Project</i>			
The proposal was vaguely written, with inadequate technical information provided to evaluate its merit. Project focus is more related to water supply than water quality. Overall rating: HIGH-MEDIUM			
640	NPS, CNPS	Cal Poly, Pomona	\$991,160
<i>Clean Water from Waste Water in Regions 4 & 8</i>			
Ineligible for NPS. Coastal water quality improvements with project implementation were not clearly established. Cost-benefit analysis should be conducted for use in dairies. Overall rating: MEDIUM-HIGH			